

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2020

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/20/3255792

The Driver, 2-4 Wharfdale Road, Islington, London N1 9RY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr William Reilly against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2020/1057/FUL, dated 8 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is the “erection of roof extension”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character, appearance and significance of the Keystone Crescent Conservation Area and the site as a locally listed building.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a locally-listed prominent corner building, visible in long views along a number of streets from inside and outside of the Keystone Crescent Conservation Area (the CA). The Keystone Crescent Conservation Area Design Guidelines 2002 (the CADG) notes that much of the built development in the area was built at the same time and retains its largely coherent, unchanged layout. It also highlights the importance of rooflines to the character of the CA and seeks to resist roof extensions where they would be visible from the public domain.
4. In my view, the appeal site makes a significant positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA. The building as a whole appears well-proportioned and turns the corner in an attractive and balanced way. Its height and prominence increase its contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
5. The proposed increase in the roof height, whilst relatively minor would, in my opinion, harm the balanced and well-proportioned appearance of the building by making the roof appear disproportionately tall and dominant. It would alter the relationship between the roof and the chimney, making the chimney appear shorter and less prominent. It would also give rise to an unrelieved and disproportionately large area of blank roof above the dormer windows on the three main, most prominent elevations.

6. I acknowledge that there are a variety of buildings and roof styles in the area surrounding the site, but do not agree that this lends the site or its surroundings such a confused or varied appearance that the proposal is less prominent or is otherwise made acceptable, particularly in light of the emphasis in the CADG on rooflines and roof alterations.
7. The proposal, as a result of its harmful effect on the roofline of the building, and in turn, the wider roofscape of the CA, fails to preserve the character or appearance of the CA. It does therefore cause less than substantial harm to its significance as a designated asset, having regard to the great weight to be given to the asset's conservation. There are no identified public benefits which would outweigh this harm. The harm I have identified to the wider CA also applies to the building itself, so for the same reasons, the proposal would harm the significance of the building as a non-designated heritage asset.
8. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policies CS8 and CS9 of the Islington Core Strategy, Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies, June 2013, and guidance in the Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017 and the CADG. These policies and guidance seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals have proper regard to local character, appearance and design, and that proposals conserve and enhance heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. The proposal would also conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Dean

INSPECTOR